



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,882	10/25/2001	Kevin W. Kelly	9911.1 CIP Kelly	8231

25547 7590 12/22/2003

PATENT DEPARTMENT
TAYLOR, PORTER, BROOKS & PHILLIPS, L.L.P
P.O. BOX 2471
BATON ROUGE, LA 70821-2471

EXAMINER

FLANIGAN, ALLEN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3753

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

10/003,882

Applicant(s)

KELLY ET AL.

Examiner

Allen J. Flanigan

Art Unit

3753

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-11, 22-24 and 26-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 12-21, 25, 35 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4, 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Claims 8-11, 22-24, and 26-34 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention or species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 8.

Examiner acknowledges applicant's election of a species (nickel) not identified by the Examiner (no claims drawn to this species were previously submitted).

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (page 4). Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

The incorporation of essential material in the specification by reference to a foreign application or patent, or to a publication is improper. Although there are a number of citations contained in the "Background" section of the specification, there are also other citations contained in the detailed description of the invention, and are thus presumably directed to essential material. See MPEP 608.01(p)¹. Applicant is required to amend the disclosure to include the

¹ An application as filed must be complete in itself in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112. Material nevertheless may be incorporated by reference, *Ex parte Schwarze*, 151 USPQ 426 (Bd. App. 1966). An application for a patent when filed may incorporate "essential material" by reference to (1) a U.S. patent, (2) a U.S. patent application publication, or (3) a pending U.S. application, subject to the conditions set forth below.

"Essential material" is defined as that which is necessary to (1) describe the claimed invention, (2) provide an enabling disclosure of the claimed invention, or (3) describe the best mode (35 U.S.C. 112). In any application which is to issue as a U.S. patent, essential material may not be incorporated by reference to (1) patents or applications published by foreign countries or a regional patent office, (2) non-patent publications, (3) a U.S. patent

Art Unit: 3753

material incorporated by reference, or to remove the statement in the detailed description incorporating these references (pages 18, 22, and 23 of the specification). The amendment must be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration executed by the applicant, or a practitioner representing the applicant, stating that the amendatory material consists of the same material incorporated by reference in the referencing application. See *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 569, 179 USPQ 157 (CCPA 1973); *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 579, 179 USPQ 163 (CCPA 1973); and *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 577, 179 USPQ 167 (CCPA 1973).

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

or application which itself incorporates "essential material" by reference, or (4) a foreign application.

Nonessential subject matter may be incorporated by reference to (1) patents or applications published by the United States or foreign countries or regional patent offices, (2) prior filed, commonly owned U.S. applications, or (3) non-patent publications however, hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser executable code cannot be incorporated by reference. See MPEP § 608.01. Nonessential subject matter is subject matter referred to for purposes of indicating the background of the invention or illustrating the state of the art.

Claims 1-7 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-7 and 12-15 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,415,860. This is a double patenting rejection.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 16-21 and 25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,415,860. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the patent are slightly narrower in scope than claims 16-21 and 25 and thus, the broader claims 16-21 and 25 would "dominate" the patent claims. One seeking to make the claimed invention upon expiration of the patent would thus be prevented from doing so by the issuance of the broader claims in the instant application.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16-21 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Schubert et al.

Schubert et al. teach a heat exchanger with micro channels arranged in crossflow (11, 12, Fig. 3a, 3b). The dimensions of the channels (100 microns wide, 70 microns deep), separated by webs 15 microns wide, result in a channel density well above the claimed minimum of 50 per square centimeter. Note that the layers of channels are interleaved. As for the claimed heat exchanger thickness, given that the illustrative embodiments of Figs. 3a and 3b show at most 8 layers, and the layer thickness of the foils given is 100 microns, this limitation of claim 16 is also considered to be clearly met by Schubert et al. Even assuming *arguendo* that Schubert et al. does not teach such a

specific value, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to provide as few or as many layers as necessary to handle the desired flow capacity for a given application of the heat exchanger. Selecting such parameters would be well within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,415,860 in view of Hoopman et al. See explanation below.

Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schubert et al. in view of Hoopman et al.

Regarding claims 35 and 36, in general, the use of a known material, or the substitution of one known material for another, is considered an obvious modification. Nickel is an extremely well known material for fabricating heat exchanger components (see Hoopman et al., lines 30-32 of column 13, for example) due to its corrosion resistance and good heat conductivity. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to make the heat exchanger claimed in US patent 6,415,860, or the heat exchanger disclosed in Schubert et al., out of nickel.


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Allam et al. is cited as an alternative to Hoopman et al., and Insley et al. is cited as an alternative to Schubert et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen J. Flanigan whose telephone number is (703) 308-1015. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Scherbel can be reached on (703) 308-1272. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7764.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.


Allen J. Flanigan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753

AJF